

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application is respectively requested in view of the above amendments and these remarks. Claims 1-12 and 14-38 are currently pending.

Claims 1-12 and 14-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,012,100 to Frailong in view of United States Patent No. 6,285,667 to Willars et al. Applicants have carefully reviewed the cited references and the arguments presented in the Final Office Action, including the Response to Arguments section, and continues respectfully to traverse the rejection. Applicants have previously described the present invention, the claims, Frailong, Willars and the differences between the claims and the cited references. All of those descriptions and arguments are incorporated here. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Frailong and Willars fails to disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the claimed service delivery element that is within the communication network where the service delivery element includes at least one internal interface to couple the service delivery element to other devices within the communication network and an embedded security layer to authenticate the at least one feature server on the communication network and to provide a secure interface for the at least one feature server to the communication network through the external interface. In other words, the cited combination does not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the service delivery element that recognizes the feature server, negotiates a security level between the feature server and the communication network and manages access to the feature server and the communication network.

It is this combination of features that the claims are directed to and that Applicants have been advocating are patentable over the cited references. In the Response mailed September 5, 2007, Applicants argued that Willars did not provide disclosure to overcome the Frailong's deficiencies. As argued extensively, Frailong fails to disclose the claims because, among other things, Frailong discloses only some of the claimed features and those features are dispersed between multiple devices where those devices are located within and without the claimed communication network. To

overcome this, Willars has been cited to “disclose a service delivery element (i.e. mux), wherein the service delivery element is within the communication network (see the service delivery element including at least one internal interface (i.e. radio access network) to couple the service delivery element to other devices within the communication network (see col. 4, lines 12-33, fig. 3 sheet 3.)” As stated previously, this feature of Willars, i.e. a service delivery element having an internal interface that is within the communication network, still fails to show the claimed combination of the service delivery element with the embedded security layer and where the embedded security layer authenticates the features server on the communication network and provides a secure interface for the feature server network through the external interface. In other words, Applicants respectfully submit that merely demonstrating by Willars that the service delivery element can be within the communication network does not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest that the features dispersed by Frailong among different devices within and without the communication network are all now a part of the internal service delivery element.

In the Response to Arguments section of the Final Office Action, citations are made to Willars that demonstrate that the features equivalent to the claimed service delivery element are actually within the communication network. Without admitting that Willars discloses that the service delivery element is within the communication element, the cited sections, i.e. column 3. lines 61-65, column 4, lines 26-30 and lines 45-49 describe a multiplexer (MUX 33) multiplexing calls between core networks and a radio access network. Regardless these sections of Willars as well as the remainder of the reference do not describe the service delivery element having each of the claimed limitations including the embedded security layer that authenticates the feature server. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Willars does not provide the disclosure lacking in Frailong to describe the claimed invention.

It appears from the Response to Arguments section that Applicants’ argument is simply that Willars does not disclose the service delivery element that is internal to communication network because no references to Willars having the service delivery element with the claimed features being within the communication network are found. Applicants’ argument, however, is that Willars does not provide all the details necessary

to overcome how Frailong does not disclose the claimed invention. As stated, Willars does not disclose these features, which are also not found in Frailong. The mere movement of Frailong's gateway interface device internally to the communication network does not also disclose the secure access to the feature services as required by the claims.

Applicant continues to assert that Frailong and Willars do not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the service delivery element of the present invention having the embedded security layer. Frailong discloses the remote management server which contains security information such as passwords and encryption keys. Frailong and Willars do not embed these features into a security layer of the service delivery element even though Willars discloses the service delivery element being internal to the communication network. The claims provide for a unitary device within the network to provide secure access to a feature server that is external to the network thereby expanding the capabilities of the network, which is not disclosed by the cited combination.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Frailong and Willars does not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the invention claimed in claims 1 and 22. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claims 1 and 22 are patentable over the cited references. As claims 2-12 and 14-21 depend upon claim 1 and claims 23-38 depend upon claim 22 and include the limitations of the independent claims, Applicants also submit that these dependent claims are also patentable over Frailong and Willars. Applicant requests that the rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

As the Applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, the Applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Serial No. 09/597,315  
Banks et al  
Case No. CE08314R

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to  
**50-2117.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Banks, Robert et al.

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.  
Law Department

Customer Number: **22917**

By: /Simon B. Anolick/

Simon B. Anolick  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No.: 37,585  
Telephone: 847-576-4234  
Fax: 847-576-3750